

**REMARKS**

The present application was filed on September 18, 2000 with claims 1 through 9. Claims 1, 2, 3, 6, 8 and 9 are proposed to be amended herein, and claim 5 is proposed to be canceled. The amendments are supported, *inter alia*, by FIGS. 9 and 13-15 and related text. Consequently, claims 1-4 and 6-9 are presently pending in the above-identified patent application. The independent claims are claims 1, 2, 3, 6, 8 and 9.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected all claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Bradshaw, United States Patent Number 5,926,755 (hereinafter, Bradshaw).

Independent Claims (Claims 1-3, 6, 8 and 9)

All independent claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Bradshaw. In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner basically asserts that Bradshaw discloses all limitations of the independent claims.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 2, 3, 6, 8 and 9 are patentable over Bradshaw. All the independent claims contain limitations of an identifier that identifies a wireless device and communicating (e.g., through a message) a request and the identifier from the wireless device to a network node device. Independent claims 1 and 8 contain a request for bridging to a call in progress, while independent claim 3 contains a request for joining a call in progress. Independent claims 2 and 9 contain a request for privacy.

In the independent claims, the wireless device itself has an identifier that identifies the wireless device and the identifier is communicated, along with a request (e.g., for a service such as bridging or privacy), to a network node device. The identifier is used by the network node device to determine if that wireless device is able to request a service. See, for instance, page 12, lines 5-8 of the specification: "The PIN number 255 identifies the handset 205 to the Network Node 250, and the node 250 uses the PIN of a handset requesting any service to determine if the handset is authorized to receive that service."

By contrast, Applicants read Bradshaw as disclosing that a controlling party (i.e., a controlling "mobile station") sends a telephone number of another mobile

station to a “base station” when certain conference calling features are desired. See, for instance, col. 2., lines 55-58 of Bradshaw: “In general, a controlling party adds subject parties to a conference call by entering the digits of each subject party and depressing the Send key.”

5 Bradshaw does disclose that changes to a conference call (i.e., once a conference call has been started) can be made without the operator of the controlling mobile station entering in the telephone number for another mobile phone. For instance, if the operator enters in the key “1” followed by the “Send” key, then two mobile stations are given a single conference call while another two mobile stations are given another  
10 conference call. See FIG. 2, line A of Bradshaw and col. 4, lines 59-62.

However, Bradshaw never discloses or implies that the identification of a wireless device is communicated by the wireless device to a network node device, where the communication also containing a request for a service, such as bridging to (or joining) a call in progress or privacy.

15 Applicants respectfully submit that in Bradshaw, the controlling mobile station is assumed to have authority to add another mobile phone to or remove the mobile phone from a conference call. In Applicants’ invention, by contrast, a wireless device may or may not have the authority to cause bridging or privacy to occur. Thus, an identifier of the wireless device is sent (along with a request for a service) to a network  
20 node device so that the network node device can determine whether the wireless device has the authority to receive the requested service.

Consequently, Bradshaw does not teach or imply the limitation in the independent claims of communicating (e.g., through a message) of a request for a service (such as bridging or privacy) and an identifier that identifies the wireless device  
25 communicating the request and the identifier.

Because Bradshaw does not teach or imply the unique limitations of independent claims 1, 2, 3, 8 and 9, Applicants respectfully submit that these independent claims are patentable over the cited art.

Dependent Claims 4 and 7

Dependent claims 4 and 7 are dependent on claims 3 and 6, respectively, and are therefore patentably distinguished over Bradshaw because of their dependency from independent claims 3 and 6 for the reasons set forth above, as well as other elements these claims add in combination to their base claim.

All of the pending claims, i.e., claims 1-4 and 6-9, are in condition for allowance and such favorable action is earnestly solicited.

If any outstanding issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

The Examiner's attention to this matter is appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert J. Mauri  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 41,180  
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP  
1300 Post Road, Suite 205  
Fairfield, CT 06824  
(203) 255-6560

Date: December 18, 2003